

Appl. No. 10/076,199  
Amdt. dated May 21, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of March 19, 2007

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 3, and 7 have been amended.

Claims 4-6, and 8-19 have been cancelled.

In an Office action mailed March 19, 2007, the examiner rejected claim number 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, as being indefinite. The Examiner suggested language that would cure the rejection. In response, Applicant adopted the suggested language. Accordingly, claim 1 is now believed to be in a condition for allowance.

In the Office action, claims 2-3 and 7 were merely objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but were noted as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the based claim and any intervening claims. Respectfully, Applicant believes that these claims do not need to be re-written in independent form because Applicant adopted the Examiner's suggested language for claim 1, thus placing claim 1, as currently amended, in condition for allowance. Therefore, claims 2-3 and 7 depend from claim 1 as currently amended. Based on the reasons above and based on additional limitations that further define the invention over the cited references, claims 2, 3 and 7 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicant requests that the independent claim and associated dependent claims, be allowed to pass to issuance in the normal course of Patent Office business.

Appl. No. 10/076,199  
Amdt. dated May 21, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of March 19, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



Hunter S. Freeman  
Registration No. 56,356  
McNair Law Firm, P.A.  
P.O. Box 10827  
Greenville, SC 29603-0827  
Telephone: (864) 232-4261  
E-mail: hfreeman@mcnair.net  
Attorney for the Applicant